

will be offering an amendment on the commodities title to change it. We will have a debate on that. I have not seen it, so I cannot debate it. We will look at it. We will consider it.

Now, Senator ROBERTS and Senator COCHRAN offered an amendment in committee. That approach was turned down. Whether or not this amendment will be the same, I don't know. I have heard it will be changed, but I have not seen it. We certainly will debate it. I hope we have a reasonable time limit on debate. I hope we don't drag this out longer than necessary. All who have been on the committee understand the different aspects of our commodity programs. I don't think it will take a huge amount of time to debate.

I believe we have a good, sound farm bill that is in the interests of all Americans—not just one area, not just one group, but all of America. I believe some of the things we have done in conservation, which is the cornerstone of this bill, are charting a new path for our farmers, a way where they can actually receive income because they are being good stewards of the land. I believe the new energy title will go a long way to helping make the United States more energy independent in the future.

The new rural equity fund we have set up is going to help bring business, provide the kind of venture capital we need. The money we provide for broadband access to our small towns and communities can be the highway to the new technologies so businesses can locate there.

All in all, it is a good farm bill. Is everything in it exactly as I would like it? Probably not; I would probably make some things different. But everything of this nature represents compromise and consensus. It came out on a bipartisan vote. All titles except one were unanimously approved. It represents a good compromise, a good consensus, a good balance between interests. That is why we are here—to work across party lines, to try to work together, knowing I can't have my way all the time and you can't have your way all the time, but together we work these things out. That is what we have done in the farm bill.

I know we will not have votes today, but I hope tomorrow when we come in we can proceed on amendments. I hope we can have some time limits. I hope the other side will agree. We tried to get an agreement earlier today to say that at some point tomorrow afternoon all first-degree amendments would have to be filed. That was objected to. We will revisit that tomorrow and perhaps reach an agreement. With healthy debate and amendments tomorrow, and perhaps Wednesday, we should be able to finish this bill sometime on Wednesday. I see no reason at all to carry it any further than that, and that is with meaningful debate on amendments.

I encourage all Senators who have amendments on the farm bill to please get them filed so we can look at how

many there are and perhaps reach an agreement on time limits to get this bill out of here by sometime late Wednesday.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROCKEFELLER). The Senator from Wyoming.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as if in executive session, I ask unanimous consent the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, proceed to executive session no later than December 14 to consider Calendar No. 471, the nomination of Eugene Scalia to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor. I further ask consent that there be 3 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form. I ask consent, following the use and yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation of the nomination and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Was this cleared on both sides?

Mr. THOMAS. I am not certain of that. I only know this nomination has been waiting now for over 200 days.

Mr. HARKIN. I have to object if it has not been cleared on both sides. Without that assurance, I have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. HARKIN. That being the case, I ask unanimous consent all first-degree amendments to the farm bill be filed no later than 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS. I object. I am afraid there is not time for all amendments. I object.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA AS IT WINS THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, this past Saturday, the University of North Dakota's Fighting Sioux won the division II national championship football game. Anyone who watched that game on ESPN marveled at the game itself. It was one of the most exciting football games I have ever watched. It was decided in the last couple of seconds. The two teams played wonderful football. They played Grand Valley State of Michigan in division II. Grand Valley State had a 14-to-10 lead with just over 2 minutes left. The University of North Dakota actually had a fourth down with 50 seconds or so left at about the 41-yard line. It didn't look good. With 60 yards to the goal line, they passed and went down to the 1-yard line. And they drove it in.

It was one of the most exciting finishes I have ever seen.

As an alumnus of the University of North Dakota, I wanted to congratulate the coach and the team and say how proud we are of the division II football champions.

We have been national champions in division I in hockey many times. We won our national championship in women's basketball, and now in division II football.

The University of North Dakota Sioux had a wonderful day on Saturday. I congratulate these young men who made all of North Dakota proud. And I congratulate their coach.

As a graduate of the University of North Dakota, I am enormously proud of what they have done.

To recap, rare are the athletic programs that can claim the extraordinary success that the University of North Dakota has had over the last year: It has played national championship games in hockey, women's basketball and, on just this Saturday, football.

As a graduate, I'm pleased to be able to announce here on the Senate floor today that the University of North Dakota Fighting Sioux won that national Division II championship football game. And they did so in truly epic fashion, coming from behind in the final seconds.

Their opponent, Grand Valley State of Michigan, had taken a 14-10 lead with less than three minutes to play. After taking the ensuing kickoff, UND appeared to have stalled on their own 41 yard line where it was fourth down and four yards to go. But receiver Luke Schlessner caught a short pass from quarterback Kelby Klosterman, slipped what appeared to initially be a sure tackle, and ran 58 yards to within inches of the goal line. On the next play, with just 29 seconds left, Jed Perkerewicz darted across. It was an electrifying conclusion that marks the Sioux's first national football championship.

As an alum, I have a special affection for the University and am enormously

proud of its distinguished and remarkable achievements in athletics, research, and academics.

Saturday's dramatic football victory fills the alumni, staff, students and friends of the university with understandable pride. And, importantly, our entire state of North Dakota shares the pride in this memorable triumph.

And so I salute the school's administration, athletic program, football staff—led by coach Dale Lennon, and, most importantly, the young men of the University of North Dakota football team. The hard work, the long hours, and the pain have paid off. We can all learn important lessons about life from these champions—lessons about perseverance, about working together and helping each other, about being a good sport.

In fact, one of the images from the game that's brightest in my mind is how the members of the Sioux team were repeatedly helping their opponents up off the turf and patting them on the back in an encouraging way it was an admirable display of sportsmanship.

These scholar-athletes play football because they love the game and, in the process, serve as role models for youngsters. In fact, they can serve as role models for the adults of this world.

And we can savor the feeling of having national champions in our midst. My congratulations to a truly superb team.

AMTRAK AMENDMENT ON DOD APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, late Friday night the Senate agreed to an amendment to the Department of Defense appropriations bill related to Amtrak. The amendment bars the use of Federal funds or revenues generated by Amtrak for preparation by Amtrak of a liquidation plan, until Congress has reauthorized Amtrak. This amendment does not, however, affect in any way the obligation of the Amtrak Reform Council to prepare and submit to Congress a plan to restructure Amtrak. Nor does it affect in any way the existing law with respect to Congressional review of the restructuring plan, and the requirement, if a restructuring proposal is not approved, for Congressional consideration of a liquidation disapproval resolution. Given Amtrak's dire financial situation, as identified by the ARC, the GAO, and the DOT Inspector General, Congress must take action early next session to provide for a restructured and rationalized passenger rail system.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to

current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in August 1990 in Burlington, VT. A gay man was brutally assaulted by two men. The assailants, Dominic P. Ladue, 28, and his brother Richard W. Ladue, 17, were convicted in connection with the assault. Dominic LaDue was sentenced to 2½ to six years in prison under Vermont's hate crime law.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE ANTI-WESTERN IMPULSE

• Mr. KYL. Mr. President, John O'Sullivan is one of the wisest men I know. Advisor to Margaret Thatcher, editor of National Review and author of political commentary here and abroad, O'Sullivan has been concerned for years about the future of Western civilization in general and the United States in particular.

In the December 17, 2001 issue of National Review, he weaves together ideas of John Fonte of the Hudson Institute, Samuel Huntington and James Burnham to elaborate on his theme that our civilization is under fundamental assault from modern liberalism, what he calls an "anti-Western impulse" assaulting "the institutions invented by classical and constitutional liberalism in its great creative phase, not merely the free market, but also individual rights, free scientific inquiry, free speech, the rule of law, majority rule, democratic accountability, and national sovereignty."

Skeptical? Then I challenge you to read what follows: "Safe for Democracy, and a Nation—The idea of this country post-9/11." It is the best statement I've seen of the challenges we face from what Fonte calls "transnational progressivism."

I ask that the commentary be printed in the RECORD.

The commentary follows.

[From the National Review, Dec. 17, 2001]

SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY, AND A NATION—THE IDEA OF THIS COUNTRY POST-9/11

(By John O'Sullivan)

One of the difficulties bedeviling political science is the protean nature of political words. As Robert Schuettinger pointed out in his study of European conservatism, the phrase "a conservative socialist" could mean a hardline Stalinist, a social-democratic revisionist, or merely a socialist who dressed and acted in a modest, inconspicuous way. When words like "conservative" and "liberal" are being used, context is all. So the theme of this article is advertised in neon when I begin with the definitions of these

philosophies advanced by two distinguished American political theorists: Samuel Huntington and James Burnham.

Writing in *The American Political Science Review* in 1957, Huntington defined conservatism as that system of ideas employed to defend established institutions when they come under fundamental attack. As Huntington himself put it: "When the foundations of society are threatened, the conservative ideology reminds men of the necessity of some institutions and the desirability of the existing ones."

And in his 1964 book, *The Suicide of the West*, James Burnham described liberalism as "the ideology of Western suicide"—not exactly that liberalism caused that suicide; more that it reconciled the West to its slow dissolution. Again, as Burnham himself put it: "It is as if a man, struck with a mortal disease, were able to say and to believe, as the flush of the fever spread over his face, 'Ah, the glow of health returning' . . . If Western civilization is wholly vanquished . . . we or our children will be able to see that ending, by the light of the principles of liberalism, not as a final defeat, but as the transition to a new and higher order in which mankind as a whole joins in a universal civilization that has risen above the parochial distinctions, divisions, and discriminations of the past."

If we put these two quotations together, the function of contemporary conservatism becomes clear: to defend the institutions of Western civilization, in their distinct American form, against a series of fundamental assaults carried out in the name of liberalism and either advocated or excused by people calling themselves liberals.

To say that liberalism advances Western suicide, of course, is to say something controversial—but something much less controversial than when Burnham wrote forty years ago. When Ivy League students from mobs chanting "Hey, hey, ho, ho, Western Civ has got to go," when their professors happily edit the classics of Western thought out of their curricula, and when the politicians preside happily over a multicultural rewriting of America's history that denies or downplays its Western roots, no one can plausibly deny that an anti-Western impulse is working itself out.

This liberal revolution is an assault on the institutions invented by classical and constitutional liberalism in its great creative phase—not merely the free market, but also individual rights, free scientific inquiry, free speech, the rule of law, majority rule, democratic accountability, and national sovereignty. It promises, of course, not to abolish these liberal institutions so much as to "transcend" them or to give them "real substance" rather than mere formal expression. In reality, however, they are abolished, and replaced by different institutions derived from a different political philosophy. John Fonte of the Hudson Institute has mapped out the contours of this revolution in a series of important essays, and most importantly in "Liberal Democracy vs. Transnational Progressivism." What follows in the next few paragraphs borrows heavily from his work, though the formulations are mine. Among the more important changes advanced by transnational progressivism (as I shall here follow Fonte in calling it) are:

One: The replacement of individual identities and rights by group identities and rights. Race and gender quotas are the most obvious expression of this concept, but its implications run much further—suggesting, for instance, that groups as such have opinions or, in the jargon, "perspectives." Individuals who express opinions that run counter to the perspectives of their group, therefore, cannot really represent the group.